



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

either unconstitutional or void. *Chenango Bridge Co. v. Paige*, 83 N. Y. 178. But if the injury was direct and the work for which the corporation was chartered was constructed with private capital and for private emolument, the corporation is liable for damages to property. *Trenton Water Power Co. v. Raff*, 36 N. J. Law 335. Nor in such a case is the charter a defense against a suit by a town. *Hooksett v. Amoskeeg Mfg. Co.*, 44 N. H. 105. For unless the charter expressly grants the corporation the right to operate so as to render it a nuisance, the mere fact of incorporation confers upon it no greater rights than those of a natural person in the same situation. *Powell v. Brookfield P. B. & Title Mfg. Co.*, 104 Mo. App. 713. And the fact that there was no wilful or unnecessary damage does not free it from liability. *New Albany & S. R. Co. v. Huff*, 19 Ind. 315. And this is true, although no remedy is provided for in its charter. *Indiana Cent. R. Co. v. Boden*, 10 Ind. 96. But if a certain remedy is provided in the statute, that remedy only can be given. *Hazen v. Essex Co.*, 66 Mass. 475.

COURTS—PREVENTING INJURY TO REAL PROPERTY—JURISDICTION OF COURT.—*CALIFORNIA DEVELOPMENT CO. V. NEW LIVERPOOL SALT CO.*, 172 FED. 792.—A court of equity having jurisdiction of the parties may, it was held, enjoin a continuing injury to real property within its jurisdiction by flooding caused by the improper construction of works maintained by defendant for diverting the water of a river into a canal, although such works are across the boundary within the republic of Mexico.

The weight of authority seems to be that where a court has jurisdiction over the parties, it may issue an injunction to enjoin a nuisance arising in another jurisdiction. *Ewing v. Ewing*, 9 App. Cas. 34; *Monnett v. Turpie*, 132 Ind. 482; *Alexander v. Tolleston Club*, 110 Ill. 65. The jurisdiction of a court may be determined by the place where the injury is received. *Georgia Central R. Co. v. Dorsey*, 116 Ga. 719. It was held in *Stillman v. White Rock Mfg. Co.*, Fed. Cas. No. 13446, where there was an injury to mills situated in one state by acts done in another, the courts of the state in which the injury was done had a right of action which they could enforce by injunction in the other state. Equity courts of one state may also assume jurisdiction where a less circuitous and better remedy can be given than is afforded by another state; *Richardson v. Williams*, 56 N. C. 116; or grant relief in case of a doubtful jurisdiction. *Adriance v. New York*, 1 Barb. 19 (N. Y.). But there is no jurisdiction to enjoin the doing of the threatened acts in another state nor to compel the undoing of the same if done. *At. & Pac. Tel. Co. v. B. & O. A. Co.*, 46 N. Y. Super Ct. 377.

CRIMINAL LAW—EVIDENCE—EXHIBITION OF CHILD TO JURY.—*STATE V. HUNT*, 112 N. W. 902 (IA.).—Held, that in a prosecution for seduction, it is error to exhibit prosecutrix's child, only a few months old, to the jury to determine a supposed resemblance to the defendant.

It is well settled that evidence of a resemblance of a child to its putative father, being but matter of opinion, is inadmissible. *Eddy v.*